

May. 29. 2001 6:07PM

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER

No. 8252 P. 1/3

LAW OFFICES

LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60601-6780

TELEPHONE: (312) 616-5600

TELECOPY: (312) 616-5700 (G3)
(312) 849-0495 (G4)

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

DATE: MAY 29, 2001

NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING
THIS TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET): **3**
OUR REFERENCE: 210606

TIME:

FROM: JOHN B. CONKLIN
REGISTRATION NO. 30,369

DIRECT LINE: (312) 616-5600

TO: EXAMINER BEATRIZ PRIETO
GROUP 2152
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

TELEPHONE NUMBER: (703) 305-0750
FACSIMILE NUMBER: (703) 308-6606 OR (703) 308-6306

IN RE APPLN. OF: ANDRES VEGA-GARCIA ET AL.
APPLICATION NO. 09/157,884
FILED: SEPTEMBER 21, 1998
FOR: MULTIMEDIA COMMUNICATION SOFTWARE WITH NETWORK
STREAMING AND MULTI-FORMAT CONFERENCING
GROUP ART UNIT: 2152
EXAMINER: BEATRIZ PRIETO

A confirmation copy of the transmitted document will:

☒ Not be sent. This will be the only form of delivery of the transmitted document.

The information contained in this facsimile transmission is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and those properly entitled to access to the information and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this transmission is not the intended or an authorized recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized distribution, dissemination, or duplication of this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by telephone or facsimile. Thank you.

FAXPTO (6/29/2000)

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 210606

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:
Andres Vega-Garcia et al.

Serial No.: 09/157,884

Group Art Unit: 2152

Filed: September 21, 1998

Examiner: Beatriz Prieto

For: MULTIMEDIA COMMUNICATION SOFTWARE WITH NETWORK
STREAMING AND MULTI-FORMAT CONFERENCING

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW AFTER FINAL MPEP 713.09

Dear Examiner Beatriz Prieto:

Pursuant to 713.09 MPEP, applicants request an interview after final rejection. The intended purpose of the interview is to allow the applicants to better understand the grounds for claim rejections.

In particular, as indicated in the paragraph starting from line 14, page 7 in the Office action, the independent claim 24 was rejected over the combination of Clapp, Bar, Matsui and Kumar. From applicants, understanding of the references, even when forced into a combined teaching, the references do not collectively teach or suggest all the elements of claim 24.

For example, claim 24 comprises a means for determines whether one or more of the first and second sets of audio data is associated with an inactive conference participants. ^{665 3/10-61} ^{665 3/37-48, 10/21-12/32} ^{665 4/6 end of first line 4/24-30} None of the cited references, including Clapp, Bar, Matsui and Kumar, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests such a step. Further more, claim 24 describes responding to the presence of an inactive conference participant by substituting a third set of data from a third conference participant for the audio data associated with the inactive conference participant. None of the references teaches or suggests the concept of the inactive conference participants. Thus, any combination of the teachings of the applied prior art references does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 24.

Applicants would appreciate an opportunity to discuss the rejection of claim 24 with the examiner to ensure the applicants have a correct understanding of the basis of the rejection.

Applicants also would like to discuss with the examiner the paragraph starting at line 11, page 11 in the Office action. According to that paragraph, independent claim 32 was rejected

In re Application of: [REDACTED]
Serial No.: [REDACTED]

over the combined teachings of Clapp, Bar, Matsui and Kumar. Neither from the Office action nor from an independent study of the references can applicants find all the elements of claim 34 in any combination of the references. For example, claim 32 requires a step of selecting a subset of the plurality of audio data streams and a step of substituting. Applicants would appreciate clarification of the rejection with respect to these elements as they are allegedly found in the applied prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Conklin, Reg. No. 30,369
One of the Attorneys for Applicants
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: May 29, 2001